DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 607 JC 880 216

AUTHOR Randall, John D.; And Others
TITLE 1988-89 Basic Agenda.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Jun 88
NOTE 50p.; Discussed as Agenda Item Number 18 at a Meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Sacramento, CA, June 2-3, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; Community Colleges; Educational Finance; Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; Educational Quality; Governance; Governing Boards; *Policy Formation; School Personnel; Staff Development; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

The "Basic Agenda" of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (CCC) is developed annually to establish priorities for the community college system and act as the Board's chief policy-making document. The 1988-89 agenda identifies 20 major issues facing the colleges and offers concrete solutions for their resolution during the coming years. The policy statements are presented in five major categories: (1) educational excellence, which includes transfer education, vocational education and retraining, basic skills and English as a Second Language, and academic standards and quality; (2) student access and success, which includes efforts to define and determine the scope of student services, recruit the underrepresented, improve the basic skills of the underprepared, offer services for single parents, and implement meaningful assessment programs; (3) human resources, which includes faculty replacement, teaching incentives, and staff development; (4) finance, which focuses on adequate, predictable, and effective funding, and on facilities and equipment; and (5) developing the community college system, including recommendations concerning state/local delineation of governance, communications, accountability, and management information. Appendixes include summaries of responses from educators to the agenda; a Delphi project conducted to gather input for the agenda; and the major provisions of agendas adopted from 1984 through 1988. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED293607

Board of Governors
California Community Colleges
June 2-3, 1988

1988-89 BASIC AGENDA 18

John D. Randall

Martha Kanter

Charles McIntyre

JC 880 216

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Board of Governors
California Community Colleges
June 2-3, 1988

1988-89 BASIC AGENDA 18

For Information

Background

The *Basic Agenda* of the Board of Governors is developed annually to establish priorities for the California community college system. It stands as the Board's chief policy-making document which identifies major issues facing community colleges and offers concrete solutions for their resolution. Stemming directly from priorities identified in the *Basic Agenda* are budget change proposals, known as BCPs. These funding requests are then put forward by the Chancellor to the Governor through the Department of Finance to be considered for the next fiscal year.

A plan for developing the 1988-89 *Basic Agenda* was presented to the Board of Governors at its January 1988 meeting. During the past six months, the development of Basic Agenda priorities occurred through systemwide consultation, two statewide field meetings held in February, local campus analyses submitted to the Chancellor's Office (Appendix A), and a statewide "Delphi" survey (Appendix B). A review of the progress made in response to recommendations of prior *Basic Agendas* was also completed (Appendix C). During April 1988, the Board held a retreat to discuss and clarify priorities, laying the foundation for this document.

Analysis

This item presents the 1988-89 *Basic Agenda* for the California Community Colleges. The document describes each major policy issue, addresses its implications for community colleges and proposes specific solutions that the Board recommends be undertaken during the coming year and, in some cases, over several years.

For its 1988-89 *Basic Agenda*, the Board has identified five major categories within which public policy statements are presented: Educational Excellence, Student Access and Success, Human Resources, Finance, and Developing the System. Achieving the solutions proposed in each section will best be accomplished through the joint effort of the community colleges, the Chancellor's Office, and the Board of Governors in concert with the other constituencies of the system. Continuous collaboration on these items is expected to occur among these groups throughout the

coming year as community college priorities for action are put into place. The 1988-89 *Basic Agenda* will serve as the main policymaking and planning tool for implementing these educational initiatives in the California Community Colleges.

Staff Presentation: *John D. Randall, Interim Chancellor*
Martha Kanter, Assistant Deputy Chancellor for Policy Development
Charles McIntyre, Director, Research and Analysis Unit

Preface

The central mission of the community colleges is to provide educational opportunities to all Californians "capable of profiting from the instruction offered." This mission was first set forth in the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education, and reaffirmed most recently in the final report of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan.

To provide those educational opportunities, California has over the years created the nation's largest system of public higher education, encompassing 70 districts and 106 colleges throughout the state and enrolling over a million students each year.

The challenge facing the community colleges in the 1980s and beyond is to maintain their commitment to providing broad educational opportunities to the citizens of a state that is experiencing rapid, and often disconcerting, changes in its political, economic, demographic, and social orientation.

To respond effectively and responsibly to these changes, and their associated problems, the community colleges must develop a new flexibility and fresh policy perspectives at both the statewide and local levels. And, these new directions must be charted within the context of academic and institutional traditions and structures, which by their very nature are resistant to change.

There are three aspects to the broad concept of educational opportunity as it has developed within the community college system: access, excellence, and success for our students.

Within this concept, access is not simply gaining admission to a community college. It also presumes access to an educational program that meets the student's need, whether it is for occupational and vocational training, an associate degree in arts or science, preparation for transfer to a four-year institution, or mastery of basic skills and English as a second language. And, ultimately, it implies access to the economic and personal rewards that society provides those who have qualified themselves through education.

In turn, without a corresponding excellence in college programs and services, access becomes an unfulfilled promise to our students and to those who support us. Finally, if we do provide access to and excellence in our programs and services, but promising students fall short of success, we have yet to realize our goal of full educational opportunity. It is to the continuing pursuit of access, excellence, and success for our students and our community colleges that the *1988-89 Basic Agenda* is dedicated.

This, the sixth *Basic Agenda* of the Board of Governors, identifies twenty major issues of concern to the community colleges. The implications of each issue are examined and solutions are proposed for implementation during the coming year or, in some instances, over a period of years.

The policy issues were selected by the Board following extensive consultation with the seven standing Councils of the Chancellor, two statewide field meetings, and special survey research. As in past years, the issues have been grouped under five broad categories that cover the major areas of community college activities.

1. **Educational Excellence**
   - Transfer Education
   - Vocational Education and Retraining
   - Basic Skills and English as a Second Language
   - Academic Standards and Quality

2. **Student Access and Success**
   - Scope and Definition of Student Services
   - The Underrepresented
   - The Underprepared
   - Single Parents
   - Student Assessment

3. **Human Resources**
   - Faculty Replacement
   - Teaching Incentives
   - Staff Development

4. **Finance**
   - Adequate Funding
   - Facilities and Equipment
   - Predictable Funding
   - Effective Funding

5. **Developing the System**
   - State/Local Delineation of Governance
   - Communications
   - Accountability
   - Management Information

While useful for purposes of organizing the *Basic Agenda*, these five categories cannot adequately characterize the interdependent relationships between and among different areas. For example, the improved delivery of basic skills instruction, called for under "Educational Excellence," is directly related to two concerns under "Human Resources," efforts to recruit faculty sensitive to the needs of the underprepared, new majority students and providing incentives for improved instruction and learning. Similarly, the question of funding for basic skills instruction, whether new or existing, must be considered in the context of "Finance" and the concerns for efficient use of fiscal resources and demonstrated fiscal responsibility.

An awareness and appreciation of these interdependent relationships is essential to the development of a *Basic Agenda* that, through its clarity and persuasiveness, will gain the understanding, confidence, and support of the many, diverse constituencies that comprise the California Community Colleges: students, faculty, administrators, and related organizations and agencies.

To that end, the *1988-89 Basic Agenda* sets forth major policy initiatives for the system, assesses the achievement of goals identified in previous *Agendas*, and highlights significant trends that are likely to emerge within the system in the coming decade.

1. Educational Excellence

In reaffirming the mission of the community colleges, the Commission on the Review of the Master Plan clarified the instructional functions that comprise that mission, placing them within the context of a unified and mutually supportive system of higher education.

The policy initiatives proposed here under Educational Excellence concern transfer education, vocational education and retraining, and instruction in basic skills and English as a Second Language. These functions, while basic to the community college mission, are shaped by the changing needs of a changing society, as are those of the other segments of California's educational community. The range of educational activities and student needs represented by these functions emphasize the importance not only of maintaining a balanced community college curriculum, but also an intersegmental perspective in policy planning.

In the discussion that follows, various policy initiatives are grouped under these functions. There is a fourth category, Academic Standards and Quality, which includes initiatives that encompass all three functions or that address intersegmental concerns. This aspect of policy reflects the Master Plan Commission's charge that, "The state and its educational institutions must share a commitment to educational quality." And, it also speaks to the Board of Governors responsibility to assure the integrity of the community colleges' mission and the educational welfare of students.

Transfer Education: After nearly a decade of decline, the number of community college transfer students has begun to increase. In large measure, the decline can be attributed to factors beyond the colleges' control: a decline in the number of high school graduates, a larger proportion of students underprepared for college, and more rigorous transfer admission requirements. In addition, a lack of articulation of services and academic programs between the community colleges and the four-year institutions contributed to the barriers to transfer.

During the past few years, there has been a resurgence of interest in the transfer function at both the systemwide and campus levels, and in the Legislature as well - *e.g.*, the funding of pilot Transfer Centers. Intersegmental efforts have been undertaken to improve articulation, and there is now a greater awareness of the need to improve information and services for potential transfer students. The goal is to sustain and increase the number of transfer students, particularly those from minority groups, who enroll in large numbers in community colleges but continue to be underrepresented within the University and State University student bodies.

- Implications

With the advent of matriculation, the community colleges will be in a much stronger position to identify and provide effective information and assistance to potential transfer students. Intersegmental initiatives have led to increased communication and cooperation, and to efforts such as those of the Intersegmental Academic Senate Committee to develop mutually agreed-upon transfer curricula and policies. These developments offer opportunities to establish policies and procedures that will remove remaining barriers to transfer, particularly for promising but underrepresented students.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will continue to strengthen the community college transfer function by supporting:

- *the efforts of the Intersegmental Academic Senate Committee to develop a common and uniform pattern of general education courses that will facilitate transfer;*
- *efforts toward curriculum articulation in various disciplines and projects to establish 2 + 2 + 2 articulation for vocationally oriented majors leading to the baccalaureate degree;*
- *review and revision of the content of associate degree programs to facilitate both transfer and successful employment; and*
- *community college participation in the work of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council and its attendant "Clusters" as a means of removing remaining barriers to transfer.*

Vocational Education and Retraining: California's community colleges are recognized for the comprehensiveness and quality of their vocational education and training programs. Increasingly, however, the colleges are faced with rapid technological advances that demand new levels of faculty expertise and

sophistication and the early replacement of costly equipment and facilities. Constant revisions to course content must be made and established programs quickly adapted to new demands of the workplace, which often require the *re*training of older workers whose job skills have become outmoded.

If the colleges are to respond effectively, and in a timely manner to these demands, they must develop the capacity for long range program planning and evaluation to assure that limited resources are directed to those fields of vocational education and training that offer the greatest promise of productive employment.

California's increasing economic interdependence with other countries, particularly those along the Pacific Rim, further emphasizes the need for long-range planning and evaluation and strongly suggests an established role for the community colleges in local and regional planning and development.

- Implications

The rapidly increasing rate of technological change demands that community college "preservice" training programs be maintained at "state of the art" levels, and that "in-service" training capabilities be sufficient and flexible enough to adapt both to the needs of older, employed students and to the special requirements of local industry. This dual function requires the development of a strong liaison between the colleges and employers in the public and private sectors, effective internal procedures for program planning and evaluation, and an active role for the colleges in economic planning and development.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will continue to strengthen the quality and vitality of community college vocational education and retraining programs by:

- *identifying, in cooperation with high schools and the California State University, those vocational areas in which articulated 2+2+2 programs should be developed;*
- *seeking resources to enable colleges to utilize labor-market information more effectively in planning new vocational curricula and to expand their use of common program-evaluation methodologies;*
- *supporting the active involvement of colleges with business and industry as a means of updating vocational curricula and staff skills and as a source of expert instruction and training;*
- *seeking resources that will encourage and enable colleges to participate in and contribute to local economic planning and development; and*

- *assuring that any revisions to the structure of the associate degree approved by the Board will take into consideration the unique needs of vocational programs and students.*

Basic Skills and English as a Second Language: During the past two decades, the community colleges have experienced an increasingly heavy demand for instruction in basic skills and English as a Second Language (ESL). In the early 1970s, the colleges responded to the needs of "nontraditional" students, in the late 1970s, to those of "underprepared" and immigrant students. By the early 1980s, most colleges had established programs of courses to assist promising students to develop the skills they lacked but needed to succeed in college. Colleges with local responsibility for noncredit adult education also expanded their ESL and basic skills programs to meet this need, as well as for other purposes.

Since 1983, the Board of Governors has provided statewide policy direction on ESL and basic skills to the colleges and in its final report, the Master Plan Commission recognized the "essential" nature of this instructional function as part of the community college mission. Although substantial progress has been achieved, much remains to be done to fully implement Board policy on ESL and basic skills and to develop a long-range policy that establishes and defines the role of the community colleges in resolving the continuing concerns about adult literacy in California.

- Implications

Instruction in English as a Second Language is offered in all three segments of public higher education, as well as in the noncredit adult programs conducted by community college districts and high schools. Even so, the demand among adult Californians for such instruction is still unmet.

There clearly is a need to determine the purposes for which and the ways in which ESL is taught, in order both to define appropriate segmental roles and to improve the ESL programs themselves.

This need exists within the community colleges as well, and also pertains to instruction in basic English skills. There is a need to:

- determine when instruction in basic skills and ESL should be classified as nondegree-applicable credit and when it should be classified as noncredit;
- evaluate the fiscal and governance, as well as educational and societal, implications of given credit/noncredit differentiation; and
- articulate degree-applicable and transferable ESL credit between community colleges and four-year institutions.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will pursue full implementation of the policies on academic standards, adopted in January 1987, by

- *assuring that these and associated policies on matriculation are implemented consistently and uniformly throughout the community college system;*
- *addressing the issue of differentiating degree credit, nondegree credit, and noncredit for instruction in basic skills and ESL through the Chancellor's Consultation Process and such other advisory bodies as may be appropriate;*
- *addressing special issues of articulation of ESL instruction by participation in the Intersegmental Coordinating Council and its Curriculum and Assessment Cluster;*
- *continuing support of student-outcomes assessment; and*
- *evaluations of basic skills and ESL instruction.*

In addition, the Board will view the results of these efforts in formulating long-range policy for the 1990s on basic skills and ESL.

Academic Standards and Quality: The goal of educational reform has guided many of the policy deliberations and decisions concerning community colleges in recent years and is, in fact, the impetus for pending major legislation that would affect all aspects of the colleges' functions. Reforms in the area of academic policy have already been initiated by the Board, however. Funds for the design and evaluation of matriculation services were appropriated in the 1987-88 budget, and funds to initiate this activity on a systemwide basis are included in the budget for 1988-89. The Board has adopted and the colleges are implementing rigorous new Title 5 standards for courses that award degree-applicable or transfer credit and for the differentiation of such courses from those that award only nondegree credit. the Academic Senate has joined with its University and State University counterparts to develop a common pattern of general education requirements and common statements of expected competencies to guide high school students in preparing for college work.

- Implications

There continues to be a need to differentiate more clearly between categories of noncredit and degree-applicable credit instruction, particularly in basic skills and ESL. And there is still at least a perceived need for more clearly defined standards for these and other categories of degree-acceptable and transfer

credit instruction and for community service, and for assurance that such instruction is appropriate to the community college mission.

In addition to and beyond these concerns for academic standards, there is the need to encourage and support research-based program improvements throughout the curriculum, and to adapt policies and procedures within the Chancellor's Office to reflect the dynamic changes that are taking place within the colleges.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will continue to support and foster high standards of excellence in all functions of the community college mission by:

- *encouraging and, to the extent possible, supporting increased classroom-based and student-outcomes research for the purposes of program and instructional improvement;*
- *providing guidance and assistance to colleges in the validation and uses of assessment data to establish course standards and prerequisites;*
- *inquiring periodically as to colleges' application of established instructional categories and standards in the delivery of certain types of courses, such as study abroad, telecourses, academic advisement to students athletes, and the like;*
- *supporting staff review and revision of policies and procedures for state-level course and program approval and compliance with minimum academic standards; and*
- *developing and promulgating the concept of "global or multicultural awareness" as one that should infuse the community college experience of future students.*

2. Student Access and Success

An increasingly diverse student population presents a new challenge to California's community colleges in providing access, excellence, and success. This new clientele requires the instructional and support services geared to the basic needs of all students: making good educational choices, being able to attend classes regularly, feeling they are part of the learning community, and being successful in their work. However, these services also must be provided within the context of the ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and skill characteristics that distinguish these students, if they are going to move from access to success. To achieve that goal, coordination of student service and instructional faculty and staff efforts must be encouraged.

Scope and Definition of Student Services

Over the past twenty-five years, changing student demographics have produced the need for a wide variety of student services that go beyond the traditional admission,testing, and counseling to include job placement, career advisement, child care, financial aid, orientation, workstudy, tutoring, and much else. In addition, supplemental programs such as EOPS, DSPS, Transfer Centers, GAIN, and others have been developed specifically to address the special needs of disadvantaged,disabled, underrepresented, and underprepared students.

The growth and diversification of these student support programs have created a veritable kaleidoscope of functions - some federally or state funded, others locally funded - that many educators believe lack coherence and focus.

The role and significance of student services in helping to achieve the community college mission is too often viewed from an administrative perspective by statewide and local policymakers, who question the appropriateness of certain programs, their necessity, or their level of funding, or who debate which roles are appropriate for the Board, and which for local trustees, in setting program and fiscal standards.

- Implications

The apparent lack of a shared and comprehensive policy understanding about the role of student services poses problems of consistency for state and local implementation of reform measures related to new management information systems, program-based funding, staffing, program standards, matriculation and fiscal accountability. Inconsistencies among districts in the way in which the purposes, scope, level, and cost of student services are defined may result in inappropriate funding and provision for such services in relation to student needs, which may in turn, impede the most economical and effective achievement of the goals of student access and success.

- Solutions

The Chancellor will study the definition and scope of student services in the community colleges and will report his findings the Board, making recommendations as may seem appropriate for Board and local trustee action. In conducting the study,the Chancellor will utilize the Consultation Process to assure the widest possible consideration of student services among a cross section of community college staff and students.

The Underrepresented: Demographic trends suggest that community college students more often will be: in need of ESL, from low-income backgrounds, the first in their families to attend college, and inadequately prepared. This is likely even if reforms underway in elementary and secondary schools are generally successful.

Since 1981, the participation rate (enrollment/population) in community colleges has declined for all groups, but particularly so for Blacks. In 1981, community colleges served one in every twelve adult Californians; the colleges now enroll one in every seventeen adults. For some students (those taking recreation courses, for instance), this decline was the result of conscious policy. Other individuals or groups, however, may have been denied access inadvertently.

One in ten Californians is disabled and their number is expected to increase more rapidly than the general population. Two-fifths of these individuals have physical disabilities. Nearly half of the disabled are in the labor force. Many need special services in order to succeed in college programs that prepare them for work or transfer.

Older Californians between the ages of 35 to 54 comprise the state's most rapidly growing age cohort. Consequently, the proportion of older students in community colleges is likely to increase over the next decade. Their needs differ from those of traditional younger students. The older student, to accommodate job and children, needs flexible scheduling, child care, and convenient class locations.

- Implications

Community colleges need explicit solutions which engender access to the total college program. These solutions must address the treatment of those who enroll, but who are not prepared for collegiate work or have other obligations and who need either remediation or special support in order to successfully undertake their programs.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will develop a plan for the review of the current status of access for specific underrepresented student groups. This plan will identify problems and suggest policy solutions to meet the educational needs of those who are underrepresented.

The Board and Chancellor will assist colleges in setting local goals for increasing the representation of certain minority and disabled students and for expanding needed outreach programs, basic skills courses, and support services, including unique recruitment and retention strategies for specific student groups.

The Underprepared: Despite reform efforts, the high school graduation rate in California continues to decline. And, graduation rates of Blacks and Hispanics continue to be substantially below those of Whites and Asians. The scores of high school seniors taking California and national tests measuring reading and verbal skills have been lower recently than they were at the end of the 1970s.

Very often, individuals displaced from employment because of economic or technological change, have difficulty in their attempts to retrain for another occupation because they lack basic language and computational skills.

Adult illiteracy is a major and growing problem in the state. While estimates vary, depending on how illiteracy is defined, it appears that at least one in five California adults is functionally illiterate. And, if immigration patterns and trends in high school dropout rates continue, it is possible that, in general, California adults will be less proficient in basic skills in the future than they have in the past.

- Implications

Economic and demographic trends, together with the open admissions policy of California's community colleges - admission of all adults who can profit from instruction - suggests that community colleges will enroll increasing numbers of high school graduates who have not acquired the skills necessary for collegiate work, young adults who dropped out of high school before acquiring such skills, and older adults who lack the basic skills they need to undertake college work preparing them for jobs or for making other positive contributions to the community.

- Solutions

To help students meet strengthened academic standards, the Board and Chancellor will continue work with colleges to implement the "matriculation" program and to improve the funding and delivery of basic skills instruction. In addition, the Board will reexamine policies on student progress and probation and develop policy on the community colleges' role, particularly with respect to secondary and adult schools, in the overall effort to improve the literacy and productivity of adult Californians.

Single Parents: In the past three decades, the traditional family unit - father, mother and two or more school-age children - has declined from 60 percent to 7 percent of all households. And, more individuals are marrying later or not at all.

The rate of teenage pregnancy is high and increasing. About two-fifths of girls turning fourteen in 1987 were expected to become pregnant during their teenage years.

Three-fifths of the children born in 1983 will live with only one parent before reaching the age of eighteen. By 1990, two-thirds of all women will be in the workforce and, like their male counterparts, will require career retraining several times during their lifetimes.

- Implications

It is anticipated that a greater proportion of future community college enrollment will be made up of single parents. Successful enrollment for these students is dependent upon the time and location of classes and, often more important, the existence of special services such as child care and development centers, career counseling, and financial aid.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will address the special needs of single-parent students through a study to identify the support structure that can help them to become successful. Areas where gaps in such services exist will then be addressed by Board policy for their appropriate delivery and funding.

Student Assessment: Recent reports estimate that over one in ten community college students is enrolled in classes taught at remedial/precollegiate levels (including noncredit and ESL), while 14 percent of those enrolled for credit already hold associate or higher degrees. This diversity is expected to increase.

In addressing the diverse needs of the underprepared student, high standards must be maintained, along with greater concern for specific student competencies. The assessment of competencies must be geared to the appropriate teaching level, whether precollegiate or lower division, and must be closely related to teaching methods.

To avoid cultural or language bias, assessment of competencies should include a wide variety of techniques: interviews, performance examinations, and review of experience, along with standardized tests. Assessment should diagnose educational needs, not just measure language or computational capabilities, and should link to appropriate help for students.

To be most effective, student assessment should be periodic - at entry, during, and at the end of a student's work. Follow-up information on student progress and performance can be fed back to students for a successive series of decisions about

their academic program and, once aggregated, this information can serve as one means for evaluating the quality of programs and, ultimately, the college.

- Implications

Meaningful assessment, advisement, and follow-up of students are essential components of a productive community college program. Of all institutions of postsecondary education, community colleges face the greatest challenge in assessing students because of the colleges' wide diversity of functions, programs, and students.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will continue their efforts to help colleges implement and institutionalize the key features of "matriculation": orientation, assessment, advisement, counseling, placement, and follow-up. In addition, the Board will develop an overall policy on accountability mechanisms appropriate for student assessment, placement, and evaluation.

3. Human Resources

The approaching need to replace community college faculty presents a challenge - to compete with other institutions and business for qualified individuals - and an opportunity - to begin correcting the ethnic imbalance that exists between faculty and students. Related improvements in the operation of community colleges will rely in part on improved teaching incentives and staff development programs.

Faculty Replacement: The average age of community college faculty is nearly 50 and increasing. This is the result of rapid enrollment growth and hiring during the 1960s and early 1970s, followed by little net change in staffing since that time. One-fourth, or nearly 4,000, of all full-time faculty are eligible to retire and are likely to do so within the next five years. While part-time faculty are five years younger, on the average, than their full-time counterparts, many of them who teach regularly will be retiring also.

Since other educational institutions also will face comparable faculty retirements, there may be a scarcity of qualified replacements in many disciplines, particularly those in which starting community college salaries may not be competitive with those in other institutions and businesses. Many of our older community colleges are experiencing large numbers of faculty retirements and the need to hire new staff during this decade. For others, the height of this activity will not occur until the 1990s.

- Implications

The need to replace retiring faculty presents community colleges with an opportunity to begin correcting the ethnic imbalance that exists between faculty (15% minority) and students (36% minority). On the one hand, replacement of faculty in low-demand curricula should enable colleges to redirect resources to high-demand programs. On the other hand, obtaining qualified faculty, particularly in certain growth areas like business and computer science, will be difficult.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will develop a faculty and staff replacement plan to address the problem of faculty recruitment, incorporating projections of future retirements, determining the potential supply of qualified individuals for faculty positions, analyzing starting salary requirements, and setting affirmative action goals. The Board and Chancellor will continue their annual review of progress in staff affirmative action and develop linkages between qualified individuals and available jobs. Additionally, the role of pre-service training must be explored in concert with the teacher training departments in California's public and private graduate and postgraduate programs.

The Board and Chancellor will work closely with representatives of the University of California and California State University to expand and improve the preservice training of potential community college faculty.

The community college system will renew its commitment to affirmative action programs, setting and working toward goals that are designed to improve the representation of underrepresented groups on staff. An aggressive recruitment plan for qualified underrepresented minority and disabled faculty and staff will be undertaken.

Teaching Incentives: Promotion and increased compensation under current salary schedules are not typically related to performance. Probationary faculty must be evaluated every year and gain tenure in their third year if they have received positive ratings on their performance. Tenured faculty are evaluated once every two years, though 7 of 70 districts do this more frequently. Evaluation of part-time faculty is up to local districts or departments.

Faculty teaching loads (just over 16 class hours per week) are higher than those in four-year collegiate institutions and the student:faculty ratio for California - 30:1 - is larger than that reported for community colleges elsewhere in the country - 19:1. Moreover, unlike most institutions of postsecondary education, community college faculty assignments do not include provision for the departmental research that leads to improved teaching methods.

A large number of faculty hold outside jobs. Two of every five full-time faculty and nearly all part-time faculty hold other jobs off campus. One-third of the full-time faculty also carry overload assignments. A recent study of part-time faculty, conducted by the Chancellor's Office and presented to the Board, concluded there were no comparable or consistent data to address the issue of faculty quality.

- Implications

It is not clear that existing policies for compensation, evaluation, and recognition of faculty provide adequate incentives for improved teaching.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will review faculty incentives and propose ways in which these may be improved, including provisions for classroom-based, departmental and institutional research and recognition of superior teaching.

Faculty and Staff Development: During the 1960s, with significant enrollment increases and hiring, concern centered around the pre-service training of faculty who came from business or from research work in graduate school and who, therefore, had little background in pedagogy. Over the past decade, with little hiring of new full-time faculty, concern has shifted to in-service staff development programs.

Currently, few resources are allocated to staff development. This is particularly true in the case of part-time faculty who typically are hired for their subject matter expertise, rather than for their knowledge of instructional methods. Even where development activities occur, they are not usually part of a campuswide plan, are voluntary, and are not tied (as they should be) to needs identified in performance evaluations. Some districts are not financially able to fund all the sabbatical leaves to which faculty are entitled.

In similar ways, the need for staff development extends to administrative and other support staff in the community colleges.

- Implications

Besides upgrading teaching techniques, including use of the latest technologies, faculty and staff development should focus on how to work with students from different cultural and language backgrounds; how to participate effectively in work on assessment, advisement, and follow-up; how to implement affirmative action policies; and how to keep current with the changing technology in the skills that need to be taught (in vocational programs).

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will work with the Academic Senate and other community college groups to develop a plan and policies for the upgrading and funding of colleges' staff development programs. Such a plan will recognize the affirmative action implications of California's changing demography and address the new demands in faculty and staff brought about by technological and economic changes in the state.

4. Finance

Community colleges need to be accountable for managing their existing fiscal resources. In addition, the specific consequences of recent declines in community college purchasing power need to be documented. Particular attention must be paid to facilities and equipment. Funding mechanisms need to be more predictable and to provide positive fiscal incentives for effective and responsible college operations.

Adequate Funding: In recent years, the authorized index for measuring college costs due to inflation and for increasing revenues has not been observed consistently. Nor has all enrollment growth been fully funded. Together with the cutbacks due to Proposition 13, these policies have resulted in a decline since 1977-78 of: (a) 30 percent in real (inflation-adjusted) total funding, (b) 10 percent in the average daily attendance (ADA) of students, and (c) 63 percent in real net ending budget balances.

The funding pattern is one reason for a decline, since 1981, in the number and proportion of California adults attending community colleges. Some of this decline appears to have been inadvertent, rather than the result of conscious policy. The impact of this funding pattern on the quality of community college education provided to those who enroll is not clear. Apparently, the number of classes has been reduced and the size of many classes increased. Student and other support services like libraries also appear to have been reduced. These consequences have not been fully documented, however.

- Implications

Funding for community colleges during recent years has not kept pace with inflation or with enrollment growth. This has had a number of consequences for the quantity and quality of instruction and support services that as yet have not been fully documented.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will undertake a thorough review of the consequences of recent funding on access and on the quality of programs and services provided

community college students. Areas for review will include the adequacy and method of funding, operating and capital expenditures, out-of-state/out-of-country fees, and an evaluation of the self-sufficiency of fee-based courses. On the basis of this review, policy recommendations will be made for dealing with areas of college operations that need improvement and redirected or new fiscal resources.

Facilities and Equipment: The 106 California community colleges conduct their activities at campuses and centers where facilities house a total of over 31 million useable square feet valued at nearly $4 billion. Because of new technological advances and the refocusing of educational priorities, colleges have changing needs for equipment and facilities. In many districts, necessary maintenance of the colleges' physical plant has been and is being deferred.

For equipment, over two-fifths of the lecture, laboratory, and supporting space are in facilities over twenty years old. With relatively little new space added, two-fifths of college facilities will be over thirty years old by 1995. Without appropriate maintenance, alterations, or replacement, such facilities will continue to decline and, in some cases, present a hazard.

A 1985 Chancellor's Office study of equipment used by community colleges in occupational instruction showed that: 67 percent was "somewhat or seriously out-of-date," 29 percent was "almost up-to-date," and that only 4 percent was considered to be "state of the art." These findings let to recent improvements in the funding of equipment repair and replacement.

- Implications

The need to fund deferred maintenance and equipment repair and replacement continues to increase. Expected changes in the college curriculum and in educational technology will compound this problem, further increasing the future need for remodeling, alterations, and equipment replacement. These needs should be fully documented and up-to-date guidelines for corrective measures developed.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will review and develop appropriate repair and replacement standards and prepare up-to-date estimates of facilities, maintenance, and equipment needs for the next decade so that the Board can develop policies to prioritize and fund present and future requirements.

Predictable Funding: When districts adopt their annual operating budgets in September, they generally know the level of their special funding (EOPS, DSPS, and

VEA). However, they are less certain of their total general state apportionment, which represents nine-tenths of their General Fund revenue, since the latter is impacted by current enrollment. This problem must be solved if districts are to plan their budgets and allocate their resources with any certainty in the short term.

Long-term fiscal planning is even more difficult than short-term planning because of uncertain state funding and the problem of long-term enrollment forecasting. The Department of Finance's long-term enrollment forecasting techniques for community colleges include the bias from prior budget fluctuations that influenced the actual level of college enrollments, but exclude the impact of future economic fluctuations. Consequently, forecasts often prove to be substantially different from actual enrollments.

- Implications

In order to properly plan and manage their resources, community colleges need more predictable year-to-year funding, state review processes that enable advanced planning, and improved enrollment forecasting methods.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will examine current funding techniques in an effort to make them more predictable. In addition, evaluation of the Comprehensive Planning Pilot Project will be completed and work continued on ways to improve the coordination of programmatic and fiscal planning. Finally, a study of community college enrollment forecasting will be undertaken so as to develop more useful models than currently exist.

Effective Funding: A single funding rate per average daily attendance (ADA) for all credit instruction ignores the substantial differences that exist among instructional programs; for example, between (a) small class programs that require large quantities of equipment and (b) large lectures in certain of the social sciences that do not include laboratories. This restricts colleges from offering courses that are higher-than-average cost, even though they may be in the public interest.

A serious consequence of current formulas is that they have "locked in" differences in college funding that resulted from 1960s and 1970s differences in revenue-raising capabilities of different districts - differences that had little or nothing to do with program costs and that were never completely "equalized." Moreover, this "locking-in" phenomenon has penalized effective college operations in some districts with permanently low fiscal support. Finally, it is possible that some community college programs, offered purely in the private interest, receive full or partial public subsidy.

- Implications

While the implementation of "program-based" funding will solve some current problems, further work is needed to address (a) inappropriate incentives caused by single-rate funding of credit instruction, (b) the adequacy of funding for some noncredit instruction, (c) overall funding inequities among districts, and (d) the lack of mechanisms necessary for fiscal accountability.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will continue the study of finance reform techniques examining new ways to allocate funds to community college districts so as to (a) address and solve remaining problems that cause the under- or over-support of programs and districts, and (b) develop funding incentives that have a positive impact on community college resource allocation and utilization.

5. Developing The System

Community college interests need to be communicated to policy makers in a more-focused way through consultation and accountability structures that provide a balance of system advocacy and responsibility. All of this work requires better information. In addition, community colleges need to assume their place as an equal partner with the University of California and the California State University in California public postsecondary education.

State/Local Delineation of Governance: The Commission for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education has completed its work and has recommended that the Board of Governors be expanded and strengthened, largely through delegation of existing legislative authority. This would mean shifting many controls from legislatively adopted *Education Code* statutes to Board adopted *Administrative Code* regulations. To date, little of this delegation has found its way into reform legislation.

To illustrate, virtually all changes to community college finance require changes to the *Education Code* and, therefore, legislative deliberation. Heavy legislative calendars mean that complex and/or urgent changes do not receive sufficient review nor are they made on a timely basis. Decentralizing much of this work to the Board, within broad legislative directives, could improve this process and possibly enable the Board to delegate decisions to local districts in a way that would improve the local allocation of resources.

A review of the *Education Code*, proposed by the Board in its 1986 *Basic Agenda*, has reached the legislative stage. Under this review, staff have examined the 2,200 sections of the *Education Code* concerning community colleges to determine what

changes are needed to implement generally agreed-upon delineations of governing responsibilities, particularly those contained in the Board's May 1987 proposal on this topic. Aside from certain substantive issues, care must be taken to provide for a smooth transition of authority and to eliminate sections not required under a permissive code (where districts may enter into any activity that is not specifically prohibited).

- Implications

Legislation for community colleges needs to include consideration of areas of authority that might be shifted in a productive way from the Legislature to the Board of Governors and/or district governing boards. Additional delineation of functions between the Board of Governors and district boards of trustees could improve the overall management and operation of community colleges.

- Solutions

Through the Consultation Process, the Board and Chancellor will continue to support governance measures that can be incorporated usefully into legislation. The review of the Education Code *is being carried out through implementing legislation introduced in 1988. Further legislation will probably be required in 1989.*

Communications: Effective communication of information in a system as large and as diverse as that of California's community colleges presents almost insurmountable problems. Involvement of other federal and state agencies like the California Postsecondary Education Commission and the Legislature - in addition to the Board of Governors - in decisions about the operation of the colleges further complicates this picture. From the Board's perspective, there must be a trust and mutual understanding brought about by effective communication with both state and federal agencies, on the one hand, and with community college districts, on the other.

Efforts at more effective communication can be undertaken at a variety of levels - ranging from individual contacts between members of the Board and district Trustees or the Chancellor and district Superintendents, to more-formalized, integrated review procedures, to more technically sophisticated communications by telephone or satellite, to more active coordination of information with the University of California, California State University, and elementary and secondary schools. Basic to all such efforts, however, is a process in which those involved in implementing plans and policies are consulted about the character of those plans and policies.

A process of consultation was adopted by the Board in March 1988 whereby overall policy is implemented by a standing order in which the following councils are

established: Chief Executive Officers, Chief Instructional Officers, Chief Student Services Officers, Chief Business Officers, Academic Senate, Student Body Governments, and Community College Organizations. The membership and specific functions of these councils are to be established in a series of executive orders by the Chancellor.

- Implications

The Consultation Process will work only with the good-faith effort and cooperation of all those involved. The timely processing of information through this large structure should be enhanced by modern communications techniques. Further, effort should be directed to creating a better understanding of and appreciation for the contributions of California's community colleges to the citizens of the state through the development of a comprehensive public information program.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will continue to implement the Consultation Process and review ways in which the necessarily complex communications required for this system may be made more efficient. The development of a comprehensive public information system will be undertaken to improve communication among community colleges, the Chancellor's Office and the public at-large, especially to improve the "image" of the California Community Colleges. Further, an in-depth review of the system's telecommunications needs will be completed within the context of voice, text, graphics, video, and data transmission among all parts of the system. Expanded use of the satellite telecommunications network and further work on the Community College Press will also be encouraged by the Board. Efforts also will be undertaken to improve legislative advocacy at both the state and federal levels, emphasizing the setting of priorities, a focus on community college advocacy, and an improved consultation process with local colleges. Finally, the Board and Chancellor will work more closely with other segments of California education.

Accountability: As with other reform efforts throughout the country, legislative interest in California has resulted in specific work on measuring the performance of higher education. Work on community college reform also encompasses this concern and, at the request of the Legislature, the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) has proposed a framework for accountability-reporting by the colleges that is to be implemented by the Chancellor.

Numerous mechanisms are available to help the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office evaluate the performance of community colleges. Included among these are:

- Review of colleges' program-evaluation work
- Evaluation of Disabled Students Programs and Services
- Operational Program Review of Extended Opportunity Programs and Services
- Evaluation of vocational education programs
- Student Services Program Review
- Annual Accountability Reports designed by NCHEMS
- Evaluation of results of Matriculation
- Work by Learning Assessment and Retention Consortium (LARC)
- Comprehensive Planning Process
- Accreditation
- Chancellor's Office Management Information System (MIS)
- Evaluation of districts' fiscal condition under AB 2910 (1986)
- Evaluation of Statewide Priorities
- Fiscal Audits

These tools overlap in some cases, resulting in duplication of effort. They do not enable the Board and the Chancellor's Office to draw definitive conclusions about community college performance in areas felt to be of statewide interest. Few of these tools are designed to measure the outcomes of work by the colleges. For instance, policies and practices for evaluating the programs in colleges are inconsistent, nonexistent in some cases, and unrelated to accreditation in most cases. The content of program evaluations varies substantially from college to college. Some colleges measure program outcomes and employ peer review, others do not. There is a need to integrate planning and evaluation.

- Implications

Contributions of available evaluation tools need to be specified and coordinated if the Board is to help community colleges be accountable for their work to the public. Moreover, if these evaluation tools are to be useful, they must lead to analyses that aid the planning and improvement of college programs.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will develop policy on appropriate community college accountability mechanisms based upon the work of the Task Force on Accountability Reform. This policy will delineate procedures for evaluating the performance of community colleges in meeting the tripartite mission of the system, examining the efficacy of academic, vocational, basic skills and adult noncredit programs, and methods for ensuring fiscal accountability.

Management Information: The development of management information for the Chancellor's Office and the Board has been confined largely to ad hoc or specific-interest reports or to the collection of automated data relating to work of staff,

conduct of courses and programs, enrollment of students, and development of facilities, and district finance. There has been duplication of effort in the collection of this information from districts and no information concerning student outcomes or longitudinal tracking. Moreover, efforts to interrelate these data have proved unsuccessful and they are not always accessible when needed. The Board has endorsed the development of a comprehensive, integrated Management Information System for the California Community Colleges. Funding was secured in the 1987-88 Budget Act to pilot test the reporting of new student and course information and to evaluate local implementation costs for statewide reporting. First year pilot project efforts have been completed successfully, and statewide implementation costs have been estimated to be ten million dollars.

- Implications

The statewide community colleges MIS needs to be funded adequately. This system should emphasize the collection of accurate data on a timely basis so that applications can be developed that will support on-going needs in planning and program review and specific ad hoc needs such as for the evaluation of matriculation.

- Solutions

The Board and Chancellor will continue efforts to obtain adequate funding for statewide implementation of MIS student and course information and to evaluate pilot testing of the staff, student service utilization, and course inventory components of the MIS system.

Appendix A

Responses from the Field

Responses From the Field

Background

Earlier this year, the Chancellor's Office solicited comments from the field concerning issues to be included in the *Basic Agenda* for 1988-89. The responses and recommendations received, in both oral and written form, from individuals and groups within the community colleges are presented below. Their expressed interests and concerns are reflected in the proposed solutions in the preceding section of this report and also in the Delphi ranking of *Basic Agenda* issues.

Statewide Forums

The following responses and recommendations on *Basic Agenda* issues were received at two public forums from community colleges faculty, administrators, and representatives of interested agencies and organizations. The forums, sponsored by the Chancellor's Office, were held on February 5 at City College of San Francisco and on February 11 at El Camino College.

City College of San Francisco Forum

1) Develop a new formula for funding facilities and capital outlay, with the age of facilities as a factor in the formula.
2) Strengthen the Consultation Process to include the concerns of minority groups in the state.
3) Ensure access, especially with regard to testing second-language students and to developing adequate assessment alternatives and programs for English as a Second Language and for learning disabled students.
4) Employ more full-time faculty and staff.
5) Provide funding for construction of new facilities.
6) Prepare students for new careers, especially in light of the impact of new technologies that require new teaching methodologies.
7) Address overcrowding on campuses; utilize existing land and acquire new property for the expansion of existing facilities and the construction of new ones.
8) Seek funding for implementing new and emerging technologies in community colleges, including the expansion of the Community College Satellite Network.
9) Seek funding for tutorial programs and include tutorial services in the basic skills category for funding..

El Camino College Forum

1) Augment existing and alternative sources of funding for community colleges in a timely manner.
2) Consider the geographical make-up of the community colleges in the Consultation Process; provide more avenues *within* consultation.
3) Examine the turnover rate of faculty and staff across the state and develop replacement solutions; provide in-service training and staff development in the areas of teaching, counseling, and faculty advisement.
4) Develop a long-range plan to address employment opportunities in the future, especially in the areas of engineering, the sciences, and teaching.
5) Improve the image of the California community colleges.
6) Expand articulation activities to include not only high schools but also elementary and junior high schools.
7) Develop new policies for priority capital construction projects and seek new funding for facilities.
8) Develop a comprehensive taxonomy for English as a Second Language courses and services, emphasizing ESL as a priority in the community colleges' mission.
9) Improve the transfer rate of community college students to four-year institutions.
10) Continue to ensure access and increase the numbers of underrepresented students through expansion of existing programs targeted for special populations in credit and noncredit areas.
11) Improve assessment and placement procedures in community colleges as part of matriculation in order to maintain open access.
12) Seek resources to meet and advance affirmative action goals.
13) Augment the planning and research functions in the community colleges.

Individual Responses

The following individual responses and recommendations for *Basic Agenda* policy issues were submitted to the Chancellor's Office by community college faculty, administrators, and representatives of interested agencies and organizations.

Policy Area 1: Educational Excellence

Include an enhanced articulation commitment between community colleges and high schools to encourage retention of high school students from underrepresented groups. Include support for articulation officers across all segments of higher education to improve transfer rates, and examine the impact of California's changing demography on curriculum, programs, and services. (El Camino College)

Develop definitions for courses and services in English as a Second Language. (El Camino College, ESL Faculty Member)

Develop a uniform taxonomy for ESL courses. (ESL Consortium, Los Angeles Community College District)

Include English as a Second Language and remedial education as priorities within the California community college mission. Retain transfer and vocational education as essential elements of the mission. Recommend that the community colleges serve all adults 18 years or older who seek higher level of education, therefore eliminating adult education. Require a Chicano Studies course for all students seeking an AA or AS degree and certify the course as meeting the general education requirements for UC and CSU. (La Raza Faculty Association, Southern California Chapter)

Strengthen and clarify the role of academic senates. Develop competency-expectation statements for students entering community college vocational programs. Address the needs of the "New Majority" student in terms of teaching strategies, curricular modifications, advisement techniques, and other methods to increase student retention. (Statewide Academic Senate)

Policy Area 2: Student Access and Success

Improve "college-going rates" in community colleges, since the numbers of students attending community colleges has decreased. (Coast Community College District)

Increase financial aid funding and maintain minimal fees to increase the numbers of underrepresented students and ensure open access. Support the development of Transfer Centers at all community colleges, with a special focus on underrepresented students. Delineate more clearly the roles of EOPS and DSPS in regard to the goals of matriculation. (El Camino College)

Provide more student support services, particularly in noncredit areas. (El Camino College, ESL Faculty Member)

Improve services for ESL students. (ESL Consortium, Los Angeles Community College District)

Seek funding for tutorial services to improve retention of community college students. (Foothill College)

Ensure that "academic floors" do not become a part of community college admissions standards. Ensure that placement examinations *are fully supported with college curriculum* to enhance success and not become an admissions tool during periods of fiscal constraint. (Equal Opportunity Programs and Services Association)

Ensure that matriculation processes do not include any mechanisms or assessment activities that translate to an "academic floor." Develop mechanisms that allow for continued curriculum and program access. Do not limit course credit to any student for remedial coursework. Provide the Chancellor's Office with sufficient staff to monitor affirmative action compliance and progress at all community colleges. (La Raza Faculty Association, Southern California Chapter)

Establish as public policy an "absolute" guarantee for transfer of qualified community college students to the California State University or the University of California. (Los Rios Community College District)

Policy Area 3: Human Resources

Provide in-service training and staff development in areas of teaching, counseling and academic advisement to improve articulation among the postsecondary segments and between community colleges. (Cerritos College, Student)

Incorporate the "personal agenda" - developing and redirecting existing personnel resources to improve and meet affirmative action goals - into staff development activities. (College of the Desert)

Develop minimum qualifications for ESL instructors, including a specific community college ESL credential. (ESL Consortium, Los Angeles Community College District)

Retain the existing credentialing system, since its elimination would have a negative impact on affirmative action progress. Hiring of new community college faculty should meet affirmative action goals required in local college affirmative action plans. Develop regulations on full-time to part-time faculty/staffing ratios in each area of specialization to maximize the hiring of full-time faculty and to limit the practice of hiring part-time faculty. Do not change the tenure system for community college instructors with one exception, which would extend the term of probationary faculty to three years of evaluation instead of two. Establish a ratio of 1 certificated counselor for every 500 students. (La Raza Faculty Association, Southern California Chapter)

Develop faculty leadership and strengthen working relations between faculty and administration leaders. Develop student leadership and strengthen working relations between and among faculty, student, and administration leaders. (Statewide Academic Senate)

Provide needed funding and lower counselor/student ratio (1 to 500) for general counselors. Develop a strong posture for affirmative action employment of administrators, faculty, and support staff that reflects California's changing demographics. Develop programs to support and address student affirmative action

programs. Ensure that EOPS programs are "over and above" services to students who face language, social, or economic barriers. (Equal Opportunity Programs and Services Association)

Policy Area 4: Finance

Strengthen our efforts to secure alternative funding "in addition to" the state budget for community colleges. (College of the Desert)

Ensure that funding of any state-mandated programs will be done in a timely manner and that these funds will not supplant existing funding. Provide comprehensive basic skills programs and do not defund these programs in terms of apportionment adjustment. Ensure dependable fiscal support for matriculation. (El Camino College)

Establish a timeline for resolving the inequitable level of funding that exists among the districts. Equalization has not been accomplished and continues as a significant and divisive issue in higher education. (Los Rios Community College District)

Develop a more workable and equitable policy for determining priorities for capital construction projects statewide. Develop a more aggressive approach to advocacy of capital construction dollars for community college projects. Consider length of time on the waiting list for capital projects funding. Create a new funding category for incomplete or developing institutions. Recognize the difference between temporary and permanent campus facilities, and do not rely solely on square-footage formulas. (Los Angeles Community College District)

Acquire funding for voice, video, and data transmissions in regard to the use of new and emerging technologies in community colleges, including staffing/operational support, the Community College Satellite Network, and related legislation. (Bay Area Television Consortium of 14 Community Colleges)

Policy Area 5: Developing the System

Improve the image of community colleges on a local and statewide basis. (Coast Community College District)

Support the ongoing commitment to planning, research, and coordination of statewide data-reporting requirements. (El Camino College)

Develop long-range policy objectives. (College of the Desert)

Provide the Board of Governors with the authority to govern community colleges as outlined in AB 1725. (La Raza Faculty Association, Southern California Chapter)

Establish as public policy a formal research role for community colleges - classroom-based research, institutional research (including student follow-up), and community-based research. (Los Rios Community College District)

Examine the extent to which faculty participate in scholarly research and the positive effects of such research within the California community colleges. (Statewide Academic Senate)

Support the architectural competition to update the Master Plan of City College of San Francisco to expand its facilities through appropriate utilization of public land, specifically related to the use of the reservoir site for college purposes. (City College of San Francisco, Jesse David Wall, Physics Department)

Institutionalize infrastructure planning for community colleges for voice, video, and data transmissions. (Bay Area Television Consortium of 14 Community Colleges)

Appendix B

The Delphi Project Survey

The Delphi Project Survey

The Chancellor's Office conducted a Delphi project as one of several inputs in preparing the 1988-89 Board of Governor's *Basic Agenda* for California community colleges. This is a summary of that work.

The Delphi is a technique developed by the Rand Corporation as a way to combine individual opinions, but avoid the problems involved in face to face exchanges. The objective is to obtain a consensus or convergence of opinion through a series of questionnaires, with controlled feedback, in which all participants participate equally and anonymously.

While used largely for forecasting by small panels of experts, there also have been attempts (like this) to use the Delphi to identify and rank the preferences of larger groups about issues, policies, goals and objectives for public services. Use of the Delphi for policy development is not so much to reach consensus as it is to explore a wide range of options, combining many individual opinions about their importance and impact.

The Chancellor's Office Delphi project was designed to have potential issues and solutions for the work of the community colleges ranked by a wide range of individuals concerned with the colleges: Board of Governors members, Chancellor's Office staff, district and college chief executive officers and chief instructional officers, academic senate presidents, and participants in two public forums held on the *Basic Agenda*.

Two rounds were conducted in which individuals were asked to use five-point Likert scales to rank statements about issues for their accuracy and relevance and to rank statements about solutions for their practicality and consequence. In Round I, respondents were asked also to comment and suggest additional issues and solutions. In Round II, respondents were provided information on the group's rankings from Round I and asked to comment if their rankings differed from those of the group.

Of 408 individuals surveyed in Round I, 163 (40%) responded. In Round II, a total of 135 (31%) responded to a slightly larger mailing. About half of the chief executive officers responded in each round. Faculty and Chancellor's Office staff response was about half that of the chief executive officers. Written comments were provided by 37 percent of Round I and 27 percent of Round II respondents. Round I comments resulted in the questionnaire for Round II being expanded by about half.

Given the length and complexity of the questionnaire, the response on this project compares favorably with other similar Delphi projects. Moreover, keeping in mind the number of respondents, it is possible to identify many statistically significant

and important differences among the mean rankings of different issues and solutions.

Issues ranked as most important and solutions ranked as most desirable within their respective subject areas are as follows:

Educational Excellence

- More students will return to college for retraining.
  - Examine vocational skills and relate to economic development.
  - Renew focus on vocational education through Board policy.
  - Identify specific training need, whether academic or vocational.

- Demographic trends suggest need for strong, balanced general curriculum.
  - Coordinate instruction and student support services closely.
  - Reassert Board of Governors' call for excellence.
  - Use results of student assessment to shape the curriculum.

- More college students will be in need of ESL.
  - Implement teacher training in basic skills and ESL.
  - Increase student support services for ESL instruction.
  - Adopt Board of Governors policy on basic skills and ESL.

- There is substantial Unmet Need in ESL.

- Students continue to have difficulty transferring to four-year institutions.
  - Implement policy to guarantee transfer.

  also,
  - Gather follow-up data on former students.

Student Access and Success

- More single parents will be enrolling in college.
  - Recognize and solve the barrier to access of child care.

- More high school drop-outs and high risk youth will enroll.
  - Work more closely with intermediate and high schools.

- There is an unmet need for literacy training of native-born.
  - Identify existing work and develop policies to address gaps.

- Many younger students slow their academic progress by working.

- Participation in community colleges has declined since 1981.

- Enroll and retain the underrepresented.
- Expand work with elementary and intermediate schools.

also,

- Improve image of lower division programs.
- Communicate assessment results to students.
- Keep student fees relatively low.
- Use more measures than tests to assess and advise students.
- Make assessment and advisement unbiased and accurate.
- Simplify admissions and financial aid application procedures.

Human Resources

- There is a long-term need to replace faculty who will retire.
  - Make annual projections of faculty replacement needs.
  - Communicate replacement needs to teacher training institutions.
  - Relate replacement to affirmative action goals.

- Incentives for good teaching are inadequate.
  - Improve incentives for good teaching.
  - Elevate focus on college teaching and improve preservice training.

- There is a need for development of staff.
  - Develop program to vitalize staff and improve competencies.
  - Conduct programs for middle management, as well as for faculty.
  - Strengthen administrator in-service training.
  - Fund programs within state guidelines.

  also,

  - Expand supply of qualified applicants.
  - Use student evaluations as part of faculty evaluations.

Finance

- Funding has been inadequate since 1981.
  - Accompany all state mandates by funding.
  - Support cost-of-living adjustments (COLAs).
  - Emphasize finance standards (how programs ought to be funded).
  - Relate finance to other aspects of colleges' work.
  - Fund the matriculation program fully.
  - Evaluate what is "really needed" in the college system.

- Equipment is becoming increasingly obsolete.
  - Develop method to update capital and equipment needs.
  - Examine equipment repair and replacement standards.

- Facilities age faster than they can be maintained and repaired.
  - Develop long-range plan for facilities renewal.
  - Assess capital and maintenance needs, noting needs of others.

- Funding is less predictable than in the 1970s.
  - Develop planning and funding technique to minimize uncertainty.
  - Develop long-range finance plan.

  also,
  - Develop method for Board to set capital outlay priorities.
  - Review relevance of current facilities utilization standards.

Developing the System

- Management information needs improving.
  - Continue development of the management information system (MIS).

- The state/local delineation of functions needs to be clarified.
  - Establish process to review state and local responsibilities.

- State and local communications need improvement.
  - Improve Chancellor's public relations and communications.
  - Improve consultation.

- Systemwide research and policy analysis needs to be improved.
  - Obtain adequate resources for planning and research.

  also,
  - Clarify role of Academic Senate in curriculum development.
  - Delineate roles of Academic Senates and bargaining agents.
  - Strengthen authority of Chancellor to act as colleges' spokesperson.
  - Emphasize collegiality on campus.

With few exceptions, solutions ranked as desirable also were ranked as feasible. And, while not a major objective of the project, there was a significant convergence of opinion (narrowing of rankings) on both issues and solutions between Rounds I and II.

There is substantial agreement among all groups on the need to address the issues of inadequate funding, obsolete facilities and equipment, replacement of retiring faculty, and the future enrollment of more students who will desire occupational retraining and ESL and who will be single parents. Chief executive officers and faculty rank issues of finance somewhat higher than do the Chancellor's Office staff who expressed more concern about how the system ought to be developed. There appears to be less consensus among the different groups on how to develop the system than there is for solving problems in other areas of the study.

Appendix C

Review of Previous Basic Agendas, 1984-1988

Review of Previous Basic Agendas, 1984-88

Past Accomplishments

The first *Basic Agenda* was presented to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges in 1984. Since that time, it continues as an annual effort to put forward and address the status of major issues facing community colleges.

In 1984, strengthening the transfer and vocational functions of community colleges and acquiring stable and adequate funding for the system were identified as major initiatives to be undertaken. These continue as central goals of the system. The Board has engaged in many activities since that time to achieve these goals. The highlights of the Board's *Basic Agendas* since 1984 are presented here.

1984 Basic Agenda

The 1984 *Basic Agenda* promoted six major goals with attendant policy recommendations. Actions by the Board toward achieving each goal are presented following each of the recommendations below.

Recommendation 1: *Establish the transfer and vocational education functions of the community college mission as priorities; continue to clarify the mission, encouraging a legislative review and validation of the community college mission in conjunction with the scheduled review of the Master Plan for Higher Education.*

Action by the Board: Local districts were requested to emphasize transfer and vocational education functions. Initial discussions began to redefine the community college mission and to develop policies to remove the programmatic and fiscal uncertainties that paralyzed many districts in the wake of Proposition 13.

Recommendation 2: *Strengthen the quality and vitality of the community college transfer function.*

Action by the Board: The Task Force on Academic Quality was convened to strengthen academic standards and increase, where appropriate, the academic rigor of community college courses. Definitions of remedial courses were developed. The Board adopted minimum standards for program review and articulation. The Comprehensive Planning Pilot Project was initiated. The Board developed recommendations for projects to improve the community college transfer function.

Recommendation 3: *Strengthen the quality of vocational education and employment training programs in the community colleges.*

Action by the Board: The Board adopted a major position statement and comprehensive position paper on strengthening the quality of vocational education and employment training.

Recommendation 4: *Develop policies to help districts improve the performance of community college students.*

Action by the Board: Preliminary drafts were completed of a model for Matriculation. The Board authorized the differential funding study and the Student Services Program Review to analyze the adequacy of college resources in the student services areas.

Recommendation 5: *Seek adequate, stable, predictable, and equitable funding for the community colleges.*

Action by the Board: Existing permissive fees related to instructional costs were reviewed and changed. Legislation authorizing districts to levy limited, voter-approved taxes, to charge fees of students who audit credit courses, and to authorize an ADA adjustment (hold harmless) to address underfunding was passed. The differential cost study called for in SB 851 (Alquist) was completed, which recommended the development of a more neutral finance mechanism to replace the present one.

Recommendation 6: *Examine governance, facilitate administration by local districts, and improve the management, staff, data collection, analysis, and reporting by the Chancellor's Office.*

Action by the Board: A joint commission to define the respective roles of state and local boards and consider possible statutory and regulatory changes was convened. Work began to deregulate and lessen duplication among existing accountability mechanisms. Field communications was improved through an improved public information office. A management review of the Chancellor's Office by an independent firm was authorized.

1985 Basic Agenda

The 1985 *Basic Agenda* presented five major goals, all of which strengthened and re-emphasized the goals of the prior year.

Goal 1: *Secure adequate, stable, predictable, and equitable funding.*

Action by the Board: Based upon the principles of differential funding, the Board developed policy to enact a new, long-term community college funding mechanism. The Board authorized the development of workload measures for this purpose and continued to seek necessary funding for the system.

Goal 2: *Promote excellence in community college programs, services, and employees by continuing state-level efforts to strengthen the quality and vitality of the transfer and vocational education functions; by securing passage and funding of matriculation reform; by developing new policies to ensure the rigor of course offerings, to strengthen the purposes and meaning of the associate degree, and to define and revitalize student services; by developing new policy and securing necessary resources to provide for the development and renewal of community college employees; and by encouraging and acknowledging local and other efforts to achieve excellence.*

Action by the Board: The transfer function was strengthened through the development of an intersegmental plan that included the "Transfer Centers" concept, which was subsequently funded. Linkages were improved with business and industry through the adoption of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) in community colleges, and a major vocational education study was completed on employer satisfaction with vocational education offerings. Work continued from the previous year to strengthen academic standards and the associate degree through improved intersegmental relations and field communications. The Board worked diligently to secure passage of the matriculation legislation through AB 3 (Campbell).

Goal 3: *Continue to review the mission of community colleges and develop recommended policy on the establishment of priorities.*

Action by the Board: The Board completed work in the areas of future study, remediation, mission priorities, and policies to ensure access, which took the form of background papers to assist the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan in its planning for community colleges.

Goal 4: *Clarify and improve the governance function for community colleges.*

Action by the Board: The work of the Board's specially created Commission on Local and State Board Relationships was completed, which recommended statutory and regulatory changes that would, in the future, be incorporated into Board policy and the *Education Code Review*.

Goal 5: *Continue to improve the effectiveness of state agency operations.*

Action by the Board: The management study of the Chancellor's Office, authorized by the Board in 1984, was completed, paving the way for an internal reorganization of agency functions, roles, and responsibilities. The Board also continued to emphasize the development of coordinated, internal compliance mechanisms and began its planning for a comprehensive, integrated management information system (MIS).

1986 Basic Agenda

The 1986 *Basic Agenda* reintroduced the five major goals from the previous year.

Goal 1 • Excellence: *Promote excellence in community college programs, services, and employees through the joint effort of the State and the community college system.*

Action by the Board: The Board continued its emphasis on strengthening curriculum priorities in all areas through the development of competency expectations of performance for community college students, largely undertaken by the Statewide Academic Senate through its intersegmental work. Policies were adopted that strengthened academic standards through delineating the course levels for transfer, vocational, precollegiate basic skills, and adult basic education. Preliminary research on student outcomes through the Board's Fund for the Improvement of Instruction initiative was authorized. In addition, the Board adopted new course- and program-approval procedures, including guidelines for setting requisites and prerequisites, which led to the development of new Title 5 guidelines.

Within the Chancellor's Office, the establishment of an Educational Standards and Evaluation Unit and a Transfer and Articulation Unit was approved. During that year, initial work on employment reforms began, resulting in recommendations by the Board of Governors that were introduced into legislation two years later through AB 1725 (Vasconcellos). The Board encouraged intersegmental planning, policymaking, and budgeting efforts, on a voluntary basis, among the University of California, the California State University, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and the State Department of Education.

The 1987-88 fiscal year heralded the birth of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council. The Council grew out of the efforts of the California Round Table to bring together the public and private segments of higher education and the State Department of Education to engage in cooperative planning and policy development activities. As part of this work, significant intersegmental budget change proposals addressing areas of transfer and articulation among the segments were subsequently recommended and included in the Governor's Budget.

During this period, the Board authorized policies for the systemwide implementation of the reform of student assessment and follow-up (matriculation). Legislation in the form of AB 3 (Campbell) was signed into law on September 30, 1986. The Board adopted a Statewide Matriculation Plan and a series of policies that enacted matriculation on the local campuses and provided for state-level coordination. First-year funding for matriculation in the amount of $20.9 million dollars for start-up activities in management information systems was provided for FY 1987-88. Second- and third-year funding was promised to meet the full cost of implementation, estimated at $35 million dollars.

To improve the college preparation of high school students, the Board authorized pilot Transfer Centers and Middle School Programs as joint projects between the public higher education segments and the State Department of Education. The development and dissemination of a high school brochure to promote articulation and transfer was also undertaken, as was the continuing development of competency-expectation statements by the Statewide Academic Senates. Staff development was also emphasized as a priority for the system, which led to the initiation of a study on staff development by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

Goal 2 • Mission: *Clarify and fulfill the mission of community colleges by fully assisting the State's effort to review that mission and by acting to assure access to and success in postsecondary education among all student groups.*

Action by the Board: To achieve this goal, the Board participated and assisted state policy makers in the review of the Master Plan for Higher Education conducted by the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan and the Joint Legislative Committee. *The Challenge of Change: A Reassessment of the California Community Colleges* was completed in March 1986, and *The Master Plan Renewed: Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education* was completed in July 1987. Both documents were developed by the Commission on the basis of extensive systemwide consultation with all segments of public and private higher education and K-12.

The Board also undertook actions to enhance the recruitment and retention of minorities and other underrepresented groups, both student and employee, through development of Board policy in this area, leading toward a long-range plan for

affirmative action currently being developed for Board adoption in 1988. Funding was sought and obtained for an equitable cost-of-living adjustment for categorical programs, including Equal Opportunity Programs and Services, Disabled Students Programs and Services, CARE, and Foster Parent Training. In addition, the Board sponsored a major symposium, "Equity & Excellence: A Promise to the New Majority," held in December 1986. The results of this activity led to the development of Board policy and budget change proposals to meet the continuing needs of underrepresented students in community colleges. The Board adopted policies on defining precollegiate basic skills and the scope of instructional programs in English as a Second Language.

Goal 3 • Finance: *Secure adequate, stable, predictable, and equitable funding for community colleges.*

Action by the Board: In 1986, the Board was successful in requesting and receiving a maintenance budget that was badly needed by the colleges. At the same time, work continued on the development of a new community college finance mechanism, to be effective July 1, 1987, and to be based upon principles of finance adopted by the Board in consultation with community college and state officials. Upon completion of the work of the AB 3409 Task Force on finance and the development of policy through the Chancellor's Office Consultation Process, the Board adopted principles of finance in December 1987, which described a model for program-based funding to be included in AB 1725. This new finance mechanism is still undergoing debate by the many constituents of the system.

Goal 4 • Governance: *Clarify and improve the governance structure for community colleges.*

Action by the Board: The Board initiated the development of processes for consultation and communication with local districts in the formulation of systemwide policies. In March 1988, two years later, the Consultation Process and Standing Orders were adopted by the Board. Again, in 1986, the Board authorized a review of the *Education Code*, identifying revisions to clarify governance responsibilities among the system's constituencies and to provide a formal postsecondary, collegial governance structure. The review was to be completed during 1986, with legislation being introduced in 1987. Currently, the *Education Code Review* is underway and appropriate legislation has been introduced.

Goal 5 • Accountability: *Improve state and local accountability for the effectiveness and efficiency of community colleges, with particular focus on improving systemwide accountability functions administered by the Board of Governors.*

Action by the Board: A Comprehensive Planning Pilot Project was completed in June 1987 and is now being evaluated. To improve linkages with the accrediting commission, a statewide-priorities accreditation project was completed in June 1987. Presently, the relationship between state and regional accrediting agencies/ processes and community colleges is undergoing review, with a new memorandum of understanding being developed. For FY 1988-89, a budget change proposal has been funded to initiate the development of accountability mechanisms based on the results of the NCHEMS study. New compliance procedures have been developed by the Educational Standards and Evaluation and Student Services Units of the Chancellor's Office. The Board also adopted procedures monitoring the fiscal conditions of community college districts in September 1987.

To improve the effectiveness of Chancellor's Office operations, the Board continued implementation of a new management structure with new positions, including Deputy Chancellor, Assistant Deputy Chancellor, Vice-Chancellors (Academic Affairs, Governmental Relations and Communications, Legal Affairs, Student Services and Special Programs, Long-Range Planning and Special Projects), and Deans (Educational Standards and Evaluation, Transfer and Articulation, Employment Training, Vocational Education, Special Services, Educational Support Services), and administrators. Work also began on the development of the concept of a statewide coordinating authority.

To enhance the understanding of the roles and missions of community colleges, the Board adopted a Mission Statement at its December 1987 meeting.

Finally, in its efforts to improve the statewide information system, in FY 1987-88 the Board allocated the first funds for matriculation - $20.9 million - to local districts for the development of local management information systems and also to the Chancellor's Office for development of the statewide MIS.

1987 Addendum to the 1986 Basic Agenda

Additional Board policies were adopted in 1987 through an *Addendum* to the 1986 *Basic Agenda*.

Policy Area 1: Excellence

Action by the Board: Board policy was developed requiring colleges to establish requisites for all degree and certificate courses. Definitions of precollegiate basic skills instruction and the scope of assessment practices were further strengthened through Board policy. The Board also emphasized its wish to strengthen the role of the Academic Senate through funding projects to improve transfer, articulation, and staff development of faculty. It also undertook the development of long-range planning in affirmative action.

Policy Area 2: Mission

Action by the Board: The Board continued to work to secure passage of community college reform legislation. Efforts to enhance the recruitment and retention of minorities and other underrepresented students were continued through a proposal to strengthen internal operations in the various categorical programs and through projects designed to address the diverse needs of these students. The Board authorized the development and implementation of processes geared to achieve measurable progress in increasing representation in program areas, including transfer and vocational education.

Policy Area 3: Finance

Action by the Board: The Board, through the Chancellor's Office, participated on the Task Force on Community College Finance Reform. This committee made subsequent recommendations to the Legislature on the merits of program-based funding. Policies were also developed as a result of the analysis of the student enrollment-fee structure to prevent financial barriers to access and ensure equitable treatment of students.

Policy Area 4: Governance

Action by the Board: Work continued on consultation and the coordinating authority concept. The Chancellor's field Consultation Process was piloted through the seven standing councils: Chief Executive Officers, Chief Instructional Officers, Chief Student Services Officer, Chief Business Officers, Student Body Governments, the Statewide Academic Senate, and the major Community College Organizations.

Policy Area 5: Accountability

Action by the Board: The Board authorized implementation of a performance appraisal system to ensure the use of measurable standards in evaluating employee performance and productivity in the Chancellor's Office.

1987-88 Basic Agenda

The current *Basic Agenda* offered five major goals that comprise the 1987-88 work plan of the system. These goals are described more fully in the Board's September 1987 agenda item.

Goal 1: *That there be continued major emphasis on securing adequate, stable, and predictable funding resources for the system and on developing a mechanism capable of distributing funds in a more equitable manner.*

Action by the Board: The Board has undertaken initiatives in the areas of funding for the community college system and of program-based funding. The "more neutral finance mechanism" recommended in the 1984 *Basic Agenda* is now in the final stages of development.

Goal 2: *That our efforts focus upon the challenges of providing educational excellence in all teaching and teaching-related activities that comprise the foundations of our institutions.*

Action by the Board: New initiatives in the areas of basic skills and English as a Second Language, transfer education and articulation, faculty and staff renewal, and academic-standards implementation and maintenance are being addressed by the Board this year. Successful in its quest for additional funding, the community college system can look forward to strengthening ongoing work in these areas and to program growth and innovation in teaching and learning.

Goal 3: *That our institutions serves as sources of opportunity for fulfilling educational needs, while also providing the motivation and capacity for meeting the standards that are required for successful fulfillment of those needs.*

Action by the Board: The Board's statewide Matriculation Plan is in its first year of operation, along with a renewed focus on meeting the needs of underrepresented students and on identifying unmet needs in student services.

Goal 4: *That management of the system's human resources receive renewed focus and modification resulting in the implementation of more effective and equitable employment policies, which in turn will better serve the employees, the students, the colleges, and the state.*

Action by the Board: Objectives in the areas of staff affirmative action, employment policy, and social and economic benefits of community colleges to the state are being pursued this year.

Goal 5: *That the Board of Governors and the district governing boards cooperatively participate in the continuance of effort toward improving and refining the community college system.*

Action by the Board: Another successful result of the board's efforts is the new management information system developing in local colleges and at the state level. This year, the Chancellor's Consultation Process has been formally authorized and field communications are being strengthened through these efforts. Also remaining as Board priorities are the passage of community college reform legislation (AB 1725), and the enhancement of the research and planning functions and the improvement of the system's educational and fiscal accountability procedures.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges JUN 17 1988